

REMARKS

Basis for the amendment to claim 1 may be found at page 20 line 6. It is respectfully urged that this amendment does not raise any new issues or new matter requiring further searching. Additionally, it is respectfully urged that the Final Rejection was premature in that the claim 1 substantially corresponds to previous claim 15 and that therefore the Final Rejection by the Examiner is premature.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102 as unpatentable over Bourdelais et al. (494). The Examiner states that Bourdelais et al. (494) discloses an article comprising an image member comprising a polymer sheet having an image adhered thereto, permanently adhered to a functional base to create a new image utility. The Examiner states that the polymer sheet is the thickness of less than 250 micrometers and the functional base comprises a microembossed polymer. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Bourdelais et al. (494), as shown in column 59 thereof, discloses a base with raised portions that are retroreflective. In contrast, the invention provides a base that comprises a polymer that has been microembossed and provides sparkle to said image. Sparkle does not provide retro reflection which is a reflection that returns to the source of the light. This would not be sparkle which is more irregular in its response to light being projected thereon. Attached hereto is a dictionary definition of "sparkle" from the Oxford American dictionary, page 655 that is representative of the ordinary meaning of the term, which is to "shine brightly with flashes of light". Also attached is a definition of retroreflective, from TheFreeDictionary.com. Contrasting these definitions shows the difference between reflectors that are retroreflectors and materials that sparkle. Providing flashes of light is not the type of reflection that is provided by the retroreflective materials of Bourdelais (494).

In paragraph 8 claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sawyer (719) in view of Bourdelais et al. (685). The Examiner states that Sawyer discloses an article comprising a sheet member having an image adhered thereto, permanently adhered to a functional base, noting Figure 30. The Examiner states that Sawyer fails to disclose a sheet being of a thickness of less than 250 micrometers. Bourdelais et al. (685) is stated to teach that

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

thickness of sheet and that it would be obvious to use the Bourdelais sheet in Sawyer. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bourdelais et al. as pointed out by the Examiner does disclose base materials within the thickness range claimed. However, Bourdelais (685) does not disclose the reflective sheet with microprisms and there is no suggestion to modify Sawyer utilizing Bourdelais et al.. Sawyer discloses retroreflective materials utilized in forming images.. As urged above, retroreflective materials would not sparkle as the light is returned directly. The Examiner is directed to Sawyer columns 20-23 for a discussion of the retroreflective properties of Sawyer. There is no disclosure or suggestion in any combination of these references of the utilization of a substrate that provides sparkle to the image. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection is under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application. In the alternative, it is respectfully requested that the amendment be entered for purposes of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-722-5023
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.